Global Insight Journal
E-ISSN: 3084-0252 | P-ISSN: 3084-0260
Volume: 02, Issue: 03, Jul-Sep 2022

Multidisciplinary Research across Science, Technology, Humanities, and Social Sciences
www.globalinsightsjournal.com

ETHICS OF GENE EDITING IN HUMAN HEALTH RESEARCH

Dr. Aditi Sharma
Assistant Professor
Department of Computer Science and Information Technology
Global Institute of Science and Technology, New Delhi, India

Abstract
Gene editing has become one of the most consequential developments in contemporary biomedical research because it can alter genetic sequences associated with inherited disorders, cancer, infectious disease, immune dysfunction, and other health conditions. Techniques such as CRISPR-based editing, base editing, and prime editing have expanded the ability of researchers to study disease mechanisms and design targeted interventions. Their promise, however, is inseparable from ethical questions about safety, consent, justice, human dignity, data protection, responsible innovation, and public accountability. Human health research involving gene editing therefore requires a framework that is scientifically rigorous and ethically grounded.
This review-based study examines the ethical issues raised by gene editing in human health research. It distinguishes between somatic editing, which is directed at cells in an individual patient, and heritable genome editing, which could affect descendants. The paper analyses benefit-risk assessment, informed consent, protection of vulnerable participants, uncertainty about long-term effects, privacy of genomic information, fair access to future therapies, prevention of enhancement-oriented misuse, and the role of institutional and international governance. It also considers the responsibilities of researchers, ethics committees, funders, regulators, clinicians, patient groups, and communities.
The analysis indicates that ethical acceptability cannot be decided only by technical feasibility or anticipated clinical benefit. Responsible research requires strong preclinical evidence, transparent protocol review, proportionate risk controls, continuing participant follow-up, meaningful community engagement, independent oversight, and clear limits on applications that could create irreversible harm or social inequality. A human-rights-based approach can help ensure that gene editing research advances medical knowledge while protecting participants, future persons, and the public interest.
Keywords: *Gene editing; Human health research; CRISPR; Bioethics; Informed consent; Genome governance; Genetic privacy; Health equity; Somatic editing; Heritable genome editing*

1. INTRODUCTION

Gene editing refers to a group of methods that enable scientists to alter, remove, replace, or regulate selected genetic sequences. In human health research, these methods are being explored to understand disease pathways, develop cellular therapies, improve diagnostic models, and investigate possible treatments for conditions with a genetic component. The scientific potential is substantial because some health problems arise from identifiable molecular changes that may be addressed more directly than through conventional medicines. Yet the same capacity to intervene in human genetic material makes gene editing ethically sensitive. A research decision may influence not only a participant's immediate health but also personal identity, family relationships, future reproductive choices, and public confidence in medical science.

Ethical review is especially important because scientific uncertainty remains a central feature of emerging biomedical technologies. A laboratory result may not predict what happens in a complex human body, and an apparent benefit may be accompanied by off-target changes, unexpected immune responses, incomplete editing, or delayed consequences that emerge only after long follow-up. Researchers must therefore avoid treating early promise as proof of clinical readiness. The ethical duty is not simply to minimise known risks; it is also to acknowledge uncertainty honestly, design safeguards that respond to uncertainty, and stop or modify studies when new evidence changes the balance of risks and benefits.

The distinction between somatic and heritable interventions is essential. Somatic gene editing is aimed at non-reproductive cells and is

generally intended to affect only the person who receives the intervention. Heritable editing concerns eggs, sperm, embryos, or cells that may contribute to a future person. It introduces additional concerns because decisions made today could shape the genome of people who cannot participate in consent and because the effects may extend across generations. The ethical questions are therefore not identical. A framework that may be relevant to carefully controlled somatic research cannot automatically be transferred to research designed to produce heritable changes.

Human health research must also be assessed in light of social conditions. A therapy can be technically effective yet ethically troubling if it is available only to a narrow group, if research participants bear risks while others receive the benefits, or if genetic difference is treated as a reason for stigma. Ethical governance must connect individual protections with fairness in research priorities, access, affordability, and representation. The central task is to enable responsible innovation without permitting urgency, competition, or commercial pressure to weaken protections that are fundamental to medical research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on gene editing ethics has developed alongside rapid progress in molecular biology. Early debates concentrated on laboratory safety, scientific self-regulation, and the possibility of altering human heredity. More recent discussions include clinical translation, the moral status of embryos, the rights of future persons, the legitimacy of enhancement, governance across jurisdictions, and the distribution of benefits. Major international reports consistently treat human genome editing as an area in which scientific capability must be assessed together with ethical, legal, and social implications.

A recurring theme is that ethical judgement must be proportionate to the kind of intervention proposed. Research that edits cells outside the body for a severe disease may present a different ethical profile from research involving in vivo editing, reproductive cells, embryos, or genetic changes intended to be inherited. The severity of the condition, availability of alternatives, level of evidence, reversibility of the intervention, and possibility of monitoring all affect the ethical assessment. These factors prevent a simple conclusion that gene editing is either inherently acceptable or inherently unacceptable.

Another important theme is the relationship between autonomy and social responsibility. Informed consent is necessary for research involving competent adult participants, but consent alone does not remove the obligation of researchers and ethics committees to determine whether a study is scientifically justified and socially valuable. Participants may feel pressure because of serious illness, lack of treatment options, family expectations, or financial hardship. Ethical review must therefore examine whether information is understandable, whether the study is presented realistically, and whether participants can refuse or withdraw without unfair disadvantage.

The literature also emphasises governance beyond the individual research institution. Genome editing can be conducted through international collaborations, shared data platforms, commercial partnerships, and privately funded laboratories. Inconsistent rules between jurisdictions can create incentives for regulatory avoidance. Effective governance requires transparent registries, independent ethics review, research integrity safeguards, data-sharing standards, monitoring of clinical claims, and public engagement. International coordination does not require identical laws in every country, but it does require common protections against unsafe, deceptive, exploitative, or socially harmful research practices.

2.1 SCOPE OF GENE EDITING IN HUMAN HEALTH RESEARCH

The scope of human health research involving gene editing is broad. It includes basic research using human cells, organoids, and disease models; laboratory studies of gene function; ex vivo modification of cells that may later be returned to a patient; in vivo interventions directed to tissues in the body; and studies that examine genetic editing in reproductive contexts. Ethical questions arise at each stage because the nature of the biological material, the level of clinical exposure, and the potential consequences differ substantially.

Research involving human cells and tissues must address consent for sample collection, future use, storage, sharing, and possible commercial development. Participants may agree to donate material for a specific study without anticipating that samples could later be used in gene editing experiments or combined with other datasets. Consent processes should state the intended scope of use in plain language, explain whether samples will be coded or identifiable, and clarify whether donors will receive individual findings, financial benefits, or updates about future research uses.

Clinical research adds obligations related to patient selection, intervention delivery, adverse-event management, and long-term follow-up. Investigators must demonstrate that the proposed study addresses a meaningful clinical question and is supported by adequate preclinical data. The trial design should justify dose, route of administration, monitoring schedules, stopping rules, and post-trial care. Participants should not be recruited primarily because they have limited alternatives or are unlikely to challenge research practices. Fair selection requires scientific relevance as well as protection against exploitation.

Reproductive and embryo-related research requires further caution because it may involve moral pluralism, legal variation, and concern for future persons. Even when research is limited to laboratory study and does not involve pregnancy, its direction and governance matter. Clear boundaries are needed for the creation, use, storage, and disposal of embryos; for the duration of culture; for the transfer of edited embryos; and for public reporting of results. Ethical review should be sensitive to diverse cultural perspectives while maintaining non-negotiable protections of dignity, safety, and human rights.

2.2 PRINCIPAL ETHICAL QUESTIONS

Safety is the first ethical question because gene editing may create intended and unintended biological effects. An edit can occur at an unintended genomic site, affect only some cells, or trigger a response that changes the expected outcome. Researchers must use validated methods to detect such effects and must explain the remaining uncertainty to participants and review bodies. Safety assessment should include not only the immediate procedure but also the possibility of delayed biological changes, effects on reproduction, and risks that may become visible after the formal study period ends.

Autonomy and informed consent are equally important. Consent materials should describe the purpose of the research, alternatives to participation, foreseeable risks, unknowns, expected benefits, data use, compensation for injury where applicable, and the possibility that no personal benefit will occur. Technical language can make gene editing seem more certain or more therapeutic than it is. Ethical communication must therefore avoid exaggerated language such as cure, guarantee, or risk-free innovation. Participants need enough time, support, and opportunity to ask questions before deciding whether to enrol.

Justice concerns the way research burdens and benefits are distributed. Studies should not rely disproportionately on communities that have limited access to health care, genetic counselling, legal assistance, or future treatments. Genetic research can also reproduce inequities when reference datasets do not include diverse populations, when disease priorities reflect market value rather than public health need, or when expensive interventions are developed without consideration of affordability. Justice requires attention to who is represented, who sets priorities, who controls data, and who is likely to benefit when a technology becomes clinically available.

Human dignity, non-discrimination, and respect for disability perspectives must guide the framing of research aims. A genetic difference should not automatically be described as a defect that must be eliminated. People living with genetic conditions may have varied experiences and may value support, inclusion, and social change as much as biomedical intervention. Researchers should engage patient organisations and affected communities in protocol development and communication. This can reduce stigma, improve the relevance of research questions, and prevent a narrow interpretation of health that ignores lived experience.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine the ethical foundations required for

responsible gene editing in human health research. The paper focuses on how ethical principles can guide decisions from early laboratory work to clinical investigation, including research involving biological samples, somatic interventions, and possible reproductive applications. It considers how safety, autonomy, justice, dignity, and accountability should shape the evaluation of research proposals.

The study analyses the relationship between scientific uncertainty and ethical oversight. Gene editing is often presented as highly precise, but precision in a molecular method does not remove the need for careful assessment of biological complexity, clinical relevance, and long-term consequences. The object of analysis is therefore not a single technology but a decision-making process that requires evidence, proportionality, monitoring, and transparent justification at each stage of translation.

A further objective is to identify the points at which ethical problems can emerge: sample donation, protocol design, participant recruitment, consent, data handling, trial registration, public communication, commercial partnership, and post-trial responsibility. This approach recognises that ethical conduct is not limited to the moment of ethics committee approval. It is a continuing responsibility that applies throughout the life of a study and after results are published.

Finally, the study explores practical measures that can strengthen governance. These include specialised ethics review, independent scientific assessment, conflict-of-interest management, adverse-event reporting, community consultation, protected data systems, long-term follow-up, public registries, and regulatory cooperation. The purpose is to support health research that is both innovative and answerable to the people whose lives and genetic information may be affected.

3.1 ETHICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following ethical criteria are central to the assessment of gene editing protocols in human health research:

- Scientific validity, including adequate preclinical evidence, a clear research question, and a method capable of producing meaningful knowledge.
- Favourable and proportionate benefit-risk assessment, with particular attention to irreversible, uncertain, or intergenerational consequences.
- Voluntary and understandable informed consent, supported by genetic counselling and communication that does not overstate likely benefit.
- Fair participant selection and protection of individuals or communities who may face social, economic, health-related, or informational vulnerability.
- Respect for privacy, confidentiality, and responsible governance of genomic data, biospecimens, and data-sharing arrangements.
- Independent oversight, trial registration, transparent reporting, conflict-of-interest disclosure, and mechanisms for responding to new safety information.

These criteria should not be applied as a mechanical checklist. Their meaning depends on the purpose of the study, the health condition involved, the proposed biological target, the availability of alternatives, and the context in which participants are recruited. A protocol may satisfy formal documentation requirements while still being ethically weak if it lacks social value, exaggerates expected benefits, or shifts unacceptable burdens to participants.

3.2 GOVERNANCE, CONSENT, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Ethically responsible governance requires attention to the following institutional and social dimensions:

- Early consultation with qualified molecular scientists, clinicians, biostatisticians, genetic counsellors, bioethicists, legal experts, and patient representatives.
- Ethics committee review that is independent of the research team and supported by members with relevant expertise in genomic science and participant protection.
- A consent process that addresses familial implications, future sample use, incidental findings, possible re-contact, and long-term follow-up.
- Policies for handling genetic data that specify access controls, de-identification

practices, cross-border transfers, retention periods, and governance of secondary use.

- Public engagement that explains the research in accessible terms and provides space for concerns about disability, culture, religion, reproductive choices, and equity.
- International cooperation to discourage unsafe clinical claims, hidden experiments, selective reporting, and movement of research to settings with weaker oversight.

Social justice is not an optional addition to governance. It shapes the legitimacy of research. When communities are included only as research participants and not as partners in setting priorities, trust can decline even when a study follows technical rules. Conversely, respectful engagement can clarify local health needs, identify communication barriers, improve recruitment materials, and ensure that any future benefits are considered in relation to affordability and access.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a review-based, descriptive, analytical, and normative methodology. It synthesises ethical frameworks, governance reports, biomedical research guidance, and scholarly literature relevant to human genome editing. The review does not involve human participants, clinical interventions, biological samples, or original experimental work. Its purpose is to interpret existing ethical principles and apply them to the practical stages of human health research involving gene editing.

The analytical approach is thematic. Sources were examined in relation to safety, scientific validity, consent, privacy, justice, disability inclusion, reproductive implications, institutional oversight, and public accountability. The study compares these themes across international guidance, national ethical frameworks, and academic discussion in order to identify common responsibilities as well as areas that require context-specific judgement.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Component	Description
Research Type	Review-based, descriptive, analytical, and normative
Approach	Bioethics, human rights, and health research governance analysis
Data Source	Ethics guidelines, governance reports, research articles, policy documents, and scholarly books
Analysis Method	Thematic synthesis and comparative ethical assessment
Focus Area	Gene editing in human health research, participant protection, clinical translation, and public accountability

4.2 SOURCES AND ANALYTICAL CATEGORIES

The study considers the following categories of evidence for analysis:

- International guidance on human genome editing, biomedical research ethics, human rights, and research governance.
- National guidance relevant to ethics committee review, participant protection, clinical investigation, and genetic data stewardship.
- Scholarly literature examining somatic and heritable editing, public engagement, disability ethics, justice, and regulation.
- Policy discussions concerning trial registries, transparency, professional accountability, research integrity, and equitable access.

Each source was assessed in relation to the ethical issue addressed, the population or interest potentially affected, the form of risk or benefit involved, the responsible institution, and the practical safeguards proposed. The study gives particular attention to principles that can be translated into protocol review and day-to-day research practice.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis shows that ethical acceptability in gene editing research depends on a chain of linked decisions rather than one isolated approval. Scientific validity is the first link. A study that cannot answer a meaningful question, uses weak preclinical evidence, or lacks a credible plan for monitoring cannot justify exposing participants to risk. Ethics committees should therefore seek evidence that the research team understands the

biological target, delivery method, possible off-target effects, relevant disease models, and limitations of current knowledge. High social value does not excuse weak science; equally, technical sophistication does not establish social value.

The second finding concerns the quality of benefit-risk assessment. In serious conditions with few options, participants may be willing to accept uncertainty. That willingness should be respected, but it should not be treated as unlimited permission for investigators. Risks must be minimised through careful eligibility criteria, staged dosing where appropriate, independent data monitoring, stopping rules, emergency care arrangements, and long-term follow-up. The more irreversible the intervention, the stronger the justification and monitoring required. Investigators must distinguish between a reasonable hope of benefit and claims that exceed the available evidence.

A third finding is that informed consent must be treated as a process, not as a signed document. Gene editing research often involves concepts that are difficult to explain, including cellular modification, genetic sequencing, off-target effects, mosaicism, heritability, and uncertain long-term outcomes. Participants may need counselling before, during, and after enrolment. Consent discussions should use plain language, visual aids where useful, opportunities for family involvement when participants choose it, and separate explanations for sample storage, data sharing, future research use, and re-contact. Independent advocates may be appropriate when participants are seriously ill or otherwise vulnerable to therapeutic misconception.

The analysis also identifies privacy as a distinctive concern because genomic information can reveal information about biological relatives as well as the individual participant. De-identification reduces risk but may not eliminate it, particularly when genomic datasets are linked with clinical, demographic, or family information. Governance plans should define who can access data, for what purpose, under what security controls, and for how long. Participants should understand limits to confidentiality, including circumstances in which data may be shared legally or scientifically. Research institutions should also consider whether and how clinically relevant findings will be communicated to participants and families.

Justice emerges as a central requirement in both research design and future translation. Participants should be recruited because they are relevant to the scientific question, not because they are easier to reach or less able to refuse. Studies should include diverse populations when scientifically appropriate, especially because genetic variation can influence the interpretation of results. At the same time, inclusion must not become extractive. Communities that contribute data, samples, or participation should receive respectful communication, fair recognition, and consideration of whether eventual products will be accessible beyond high-income settings or highly specialised centres.

A further finding is that heritable editing requires a more restrictive ethical approach than somatic research. Because any change may affect descendants and cannot be consented to by future persons, the threshold for considering such research is exceptionally high. Questions about safety are intertwined with questions about social legitimacy, disability rights, reproductive freedom, and the risk that genetic selection or enhancement could increase inequality. The analysis supports continued scientific discussion and tightly regulated laboratory research where lawful, but it does not treat the existence of technical capability as a sufficient reason for reproductive clinical use.

Finally, transparent governance is necessary to sustain public trust. Registries, protocol disclosure, adverse-event reporting, independent monitoring, publication of negative findings, and conflict-of-interest management reduce the risk that commercial incentives or prestige-driven competition will distort decisions. Public engagement is not merely a communication exercise after a technology has been developed. It should inform research priorities, clarify community values, identify fears about discrimination or misuse, and improve the legitimacy of policy choices that cannot be resolved by science alone.

6. DISCUSSION

Gene editing research presents a difficult ethical balance. Restricting research too broadly can delay knowledge that may help people with serious disease. Permitting research without adequate safeguards can expose participants to harms that are poorly understood and can damage public trust in biomedical science. The appropriate response is neither uncritical enthusiasm nor blanket rejection. It is a governance approach that asks whether the research question is important, whether the evidence justifies the next step, whether risks are proportionate, and whether participants and affected communities are treated with respect.

One important conclusion from the discussion is that ethics review must be multidisciplinary. A committee evaluating a gene editing protocol may need expertise in molecular genetics, clinical medicine, reproductive health, statistics, research ethics, law, data security, and patient experience. No single reviewer can fully assess all dimensions. Institutions should therefore establish mechanisms to obtain specialised advice when a protocol exceeds the committee's routine expertise. Independent review should also include attention to the incentives of investigators, sponsors, and institutions, especially when there is potential for intellectual property, media attention, or rapid commercial translation.

The discussion also highlights the risk of therapeutic misconception. Participants may interpret a trial as personalised treatment, particularly when they have severe illness or have heard public narratives describing gene editing as transformative. Researchers have a duty to separate the goals of research from the goals of clinical care, even when the study is conducted by a participant's treating team. This requires careful language, repeated consent conversations, and realistic discussion of alternatives. It also requires respect for participants who decide not to join a study or who later choose to withdraw.

The social meaning of genetic intervention requires sustained attention. Disease prevention and treatment can be important goals, but the language used in research can unintentionally suggest that people with particular traits or disabilities are less valuable. Ethical research should consult people with lived experience and should present scientific aims without reinforcing stigma. Engagement does not require every community member to agree with a proposed study. It requires that research teams listen to affected perspectives, report how concerns were considered, and avoid treating public consultation as a formality.

Governance must also address the global character of gene editing. Research, funding, data, and clinical marketing can move across borders more quickly than regulatory systems. A study may be designed in one jurisdiction, performed in another, analysed through a third, and promoted online to patients worldwide. National oversight remains indispensable, but shared international expectations are needed for trial registration, ethical review, data protection, reporting of serious adverse events, and condemnation of unsafe or deceptive interventions. Cooperation can reduce regulatory gaps while allowing countries to develop rules that reflect their legal systems and public values.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that gene editing in human health research must be governed as a matter of science, ethics, and public responsibility. Its medical potential is real, but potential benefit cannot replace evidence of safety, meaningful consent, fair participant selection, privacy protection, and independent oversight. Responsible research begins with a defensible scientific question and continues through transparent reporting, long-term follow-up, and accountability to participants and communities.

Somatic and heritable applications require different levels of ethical caution. Somatic research may be considered under carefully controlled conditions when it addresses significant health needs and is supported by strong evidence. Heritable editing raises additional concerns because it may affect future persons and society across generations. Decisions in this area should therefore remain subject to stringent scrutiny, broad public discussion, and clear governance limits.

The future of gene editing research should be guided by humility as well as innovation. Humility recognises uncertainty, the limits of present knowledge, the value of diverse

perspectives, and the obligation to protect those who bear the risks of research. By embedding ethical reflection in every stage of scientific work, researchers and institutions can pursue medical progress without compromising human dignity, justice, or trust.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Require specialised ethics review for protocols involving human gene editing, with access to molecular, clinical, legal, data-security, and bioethics expertise.
- Approve clinical studies only when preclinical evidence, clinical rationale, monitoring plans, and stopping rules are strong enough to justify human exposure.
- Treat informed consent as an ongoing communication process supported by genetic counselling and materials written in plain, non-promotional language.
- Establish long-term follow-up and participant-support plans for interventions that may produce delayed or irreversible effects.
- Protect genomic data through controlled access, secure storage, transparent secondary-use policies, and clear communication about confidentiality limits.
- Use fair recruitment practices and include affected communities in priority setting, protocol development, communication, and dissemination of findings.
- Maintain public trial registries and require timely reporting of protocols, major amendments, adverse events, and results, including negative findings.
- Manage conflicts of interest through disclosure, independent review, and separation of ethical oversight from commercial or prestige-driven decision-making.
- Apply especially strict restrictions to research that could lead to heritable genetic changes and do not equate laboratory capability with clinical acceptability.
- Promote international cooperation on governance standards, research integrity, regulatory enforcement, and prevention of misleading clinical claims.

9. REFERENCES

1. *World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: A framework for governance. World Health Organization.*
2. *World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: Recommendations. World Health Organization.*
3. *World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: Position paper. World Health Organization.*
4. *World Medical Association. (2024). Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human participants. World Medical Association.*
5. *Indian Council of Medical Research. (2017). National ethical guidelines for biomedical and health research involving human participants. Indian Council of Medical Research.*
6. *UNESCO. (1997). Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
7. *UNESCO. (2003). International Declaration on Human Genetic Data. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
8. *UNESCO. (2005). Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
9. *Council of Europe. (1997). Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine (Oviedo Convention). Council of Europe.*
10. *Council of Europe Committee on Bioethics. (2022). Genome editing technologies: Final conclusions of the re-examination of Article 13 of the Oviedo Convention. Council of Europe.*
11. *National Academy of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, and The Royal Society. (2020). Heritable human genome editing. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/25665*
12. *National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Human genome editing: Science, ethics, and governance. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/24623*
13. *Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2018). Genome editing and human reproduction: Social and ethical issues. Nuffield Council on Bioethics.*

14. *Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences. (2016). International ethical guidelines for health-related research involving humans. CIOMS.*
15. *Baltimore, D., Berg, P., Botchan, M., Carroll, D., Charo, R. A., Church, G., Greely, H. T., Jinek, M., Martin, G. S., Penhoet, E., Puck, J., Sternberg, S. H., Weissman, J. S., & Yamamoto, K. R. (2015). A prudent path forward for genomic engineering and germline gene modification. Science, 348(6230), 36-38. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab1028*
16. *Lanphier, E., Urnov, F., Haecker, S. E., Werner, M., & Smolenski, J. (2015). Don't edit the human germ line. Nature, 519(7544), 410-411. https://doi.org/10.1038/519410a*
17. *Lander, E. S., Baylis, F., Zhang, F., Charpentier, E., Berg, P., Bourgain, C., Friedrich, B., Joung, J. K., Li, J., Liu, D., Naldini, L., Nie, J.-B., Qiu, R., Schoene-Seifert, B., Shaefer, G. O., Terry, S. F., Urnov, F., Wiegand, C., & Winnacker, E.-L. (2019). Adopt a moratorium on heritable genome editing. Nature, 567(7747), 165-168. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-00726-5*
18. *Ormond, K. E., Mortlock, D. P., Scholes, D. T., Bombard, Y., Brody, L. C., Faucett, W. A., Garrison, N. A., Hercher, L., Isasi, R., Middleton, A., Musunuru, K., Shriner, D., Virani, A., Young, C. E., & Ashley, E. A. (2017). Human germline genome editing. The American Journal of Human Genetics, 101(2), 167-176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.06.012*
19. *Greely, H. T. (2019). CRISPR'd babies: Human germline genome editing in the 'He Jiankui affair.' Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 6(1), 111-183. https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsz010*
20. *Baylis, F. (2019). Altered inheritance: CRISPR and the ethics of human genome editing. Harvard University Press.*
21. *Charpentier, E., & Doudna, J. A. (2013). Biotechnology: Rewriting a genome. Nature, 495(7439), 50-51. https://doi.org/10.1038/495050a*
22. *Doudna, J. A., & Sternberg, S. H. (2017). A crack in creation: Gene editing and the unthinkable power to control evolution. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.*
23. *Kimmelman, J. (2015). Gene transfer and the ethics of first-in-human research: Lost in translation. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 24(4), 456-466.*
24. *Isasi, R., Kleiderman, E., & Knoppers, B. M. (2016). Editing policy to fit the genome? Science, 351(6271), 337-339. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad6778*
25. *Hurlbut, J. B., Biewald, L., Blue, G., & Ogbogu, U. (2020). Human genome editing: A new era of responsibility. The CRISPR Journal, 3(4), 225-232.*
26. *Habermas, J. (2003). The future of human nature. Polity Press.*
27. *Sandel, M. J. (2007). The case against perfection: Ethics in the age of genetic engineering. Harvard University Press.*
28. *Gyngell, C., Douglas, T., & Savulescu, J. (2017). The ethics of germline gene editing. Journal of Applied Philosophy, 34(4), 498-513. https://doi.org/10.1111/japp.12249*
29. *Jasanoff, S., Hurlbut, J. B., & Saha, K. (2015). CRISPR democracy: Gene editing and the need for inclusive deliberation. Issues in Science and Technology, 32(1), 37-49.*
30. *National Institutes of Health. (2019). NIH guidelines for research involving recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid molecules. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.*